

## REMARKS

Claims 1-41 were pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, applicants have cancelled claims 15, 19-27, and 31, and amended claims 1, 2, 10, 16, 28-30, 32-34, and 38. Claims 1-14, 16-18, 28-30, and 32-41 are now pending for reconsideration.

The applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for allowing claims 1-14 and 34-41 and indicating allowable subject matter in claims 16-18, 28-30, 32, and 33. For business reasons not related to patentability, in order to expedite the issuance of a patent, applicants have rewritten claims 16, 28, 29, 30, 32, and 33 in independent form, in order to place the application in condition for allowance. The applicant notes that these claims are simply rewritten and not changed in scope in any way from the originally presented claims. Accordingly no claim scope or equivalents are surrendered by simply placing these allowable claims in condition for issuance. The remaining dependent claims depend either directly or indirectly from one of the allowable claims.

Applicants have made editorial amendments to allowed claims 1, 2, 10, 34 and 38. Namely, in claims 1, 34, and 38, an inadvertent period (.) in the middle of the claims is replaced with a semi-colon (;). In claims 2 and 10, an inadvertent misspelling of the word "comparison" is corrected. Applicants also note that claim 32 includes an editorial amendment to change the phrase "subgrouping" to --sub grouping--.

The applicant disagrees with and does not acquiesce to the rejection of claims 15, 19-27 and 31. The applicant reserves the right to pursue these claims or other claims in a continuation application.

## COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

While not bearing on the patentability or interpretation of the claims, Applicants note that the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance inadvertently combines several recitations from various of the allowed independent claims. For example, claim 1 does not recite "multiple base codes," as mentioned in the Examiner's statement. Applicants submit that the claims are allowable because the prior art does not teach or suggest the respective inventions as recited in the respective claims. If the Examiner disagrees or otherwise

considers it necessary, applicants respectfully request a corrected statement of reasons for allowance provided with the Notice of Allowance.

In view of the foregoing, the application is considered to be in condition for allowance. Early notification of the same is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

January 7, 2004

Date

Intel Americas, Inc.  
4030 Lafayette Center Drive, LF3  
Chantilly, VA 20151



Paul E. Steiner  
Reg. No. 41,326  
(703) 633-6830